Extra: Mrs. Shipley Picks McCarthyite to Succeed Her as Travel Czarina. Page 4.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. III, NUMBER 8 MARCH 14, 1955 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Hatred, Not Hydrogen, Is The Fatal Explosive

In all the widening international debate on the H-bomb, a central issue seems to be avoided. It is not hydrogen, but hatred, which threatens the future of mankind. We cannot go on building up hateful attitudes without making a fatal explosion unavoidable. Sir Winston Churchill's finest rhetoric cannot mask the specious character of the hope he expressed to the House of Commons—that by a "sublime irony" it may develop that "safety will be the sturdy child of terror and survival the twin brother of annihilation." This is only a newer restatement of an old fallacy—that to preserve peace, prepare for war. The accumulation of armament, the steady stepping up of tension, the increase in fear have often made war inescapable over some slight incident which might have been passed over safely, in other circumstances, particularly if the great Powers were not so well prepared.*

Nuclear fission and fusion have changed nothing whatsoever in the nature of man. When tension builds up to a certain point, the long-expected war comes almost as a physical and organic relief. Civilizations have destroyed themselves before; the risk of death and annihilation is a commonplace to the soldier; that larger annihilation, perhaps of all mankind, is only an abstraction to the individual. The same men who would go bravely into death in battle cringe like the worst cowards before the more onerous duty of serving their country by speaking unpopular truths.

If we go on developing in the United States the mental climate of the cold war, building up a picture of the Soviet bloc as a monstrous society, permitting military men and priests (in the immemorial fashion of their kind) to create the notion that the alternative to war is "slavery," that *this* conflict (like virtually every other war mankind has known) is a holy crusade, then war will become inescapable.

It is a fallacy to believe that there can be peaceful coexistence in a world split between heavily armed Powers glowering with jealousy, suspicion and hatred across the line between them. Peace is only possible with charity, and charity in this context means a readiness to understand how these new revolutionary societies developed, to see the good as well as the evil in them, in short to take a pragmatic, adult, humane and compassionate view of our fellow travellers on this tiny and perhaps already fated planet—and above all to recognize the quite fantastically swollen mote in our own eye when we talk glibly of ourselves as the "free world."

Our scientists, months later, have begun to echo Nehru's plan for a standstill agreement on further atomic tests. The more tests the more we frighten ourselves and others toward war; the more "total" the weapons become, the more insinuating the whisper that maybe we had better drop one first before the enemy does. But basically we need most a standstill agreement on the propagation of hatred.

The Russians were hooted down when they proposed a ban on war propaganda at the UN some years ago; admittedly such a ban could not be reconciled with a free press. But to say that is to stop at half-truths. The fact is that our government gives the line to public opinion, and that the same people who recoiled from banning war propaganda have been doing their best to ban peace propaganda. The witch hunt has made talk of peace dangerous and shrivelled up the peace movement. Yet what is said here for a comparative handful ought to be a major topic of debate on press and radio. Our own hatred, skilfully and perpetually fostered in all we read and hear, may yet be our destruction; this is the fatal explosive.

A Frightened Giant Who Ties Himself Up in Knots

We have worked ourselves up into such a state of awe about our own terror weapons that we are hampering our own efforts to protect ourselves; security regulations designed to keep secrets from the enemy encumber our own defense plans. The whole American atomic security craze is passing the point of diminishing returns. An example the press ignored was brought to light by Senator Symington of Missouri last Tuesday in interrogating William F. Tompkins, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Department of Justice's Internal Security division, about the Administration's security program.

Symington said Civil Defense Administrator Val Peterson, testifying four days earlier before a Senate Armed Services subcommittee, said security regulations "made it extremely difficult for us to work in the area of preparation to take effective steps to meet the threat of fall-out." Peterson declared "we simply could not reveal that data to the Bureau of Public Roads. It is classified . . . and even in my own organization . . . we could not discuss the fall-out problem or fall-out data even with the people in our own organizaion who were cleared to accept secrets (sic) because they did not have Q clearance."

In other words, employes already cleared for security in civil defense were unable to take part in planning against fall-out because they did not have Q clearance. (Washington will soon have as many types of clearance as H. J. Heinz has pickles.) With all the talk about fall-out and security, no newspaper seems to have reported either the Peterson testimony or Symington's reference to it. Yet here we have a real security problem arising from an excess of "security."

* It is disturbing to find in the Fact Sheet sent out by the Democratic National Committee last week that the Eisenhower defense cuts are opposed on the ground that "Army cut-backs thwarted Administration desire for troop intervention to save Indo-China."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ROUND OUR GIDDY CAPITAL

Far East Crisis: A month ago State Department officials were talking in private briefings of "swopping" Quemoy and Matsu for a cease-fire in the Formosa straits, but last week in his appearance behind the closed doors of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Dulles took a stiffer position, denied that any such bargain would be considered. Peking seems to have upped its terms, too, and there are indications that not only the coastal islands but a UN seat are its price for a cease-fire . . . The prevalent opinion in the press corps is that the Eisenhower Administration would like some graceful way to get off the hook at Quemoy and Matsu, but nobody is sure just what dominant policy is. The same lines of divergence are visible, with Defense Secretary Wilson and Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey for disengagement while Dulles plays to the Knowland-Radford team . . . A sharp crisis is in sight over the Finnish oil tanker, the Aruba, with State Department hinting last Wednesday that despite angry "dares" from Peking the vessel would be stopped . . .

Keeping Ourselves Confused: So great is the confusion created by the deliberate obscurity in foreign affairs that press men are about equally divided between the theory that Eden's speech and Dulles's reflect a sharp difference in Anglo-American policy, and those who believe them the product of private agreement, with Dulles "firm" while Eden negotiates . . . The latter point to the passage in the Dulles speech where he expresses the hope that the present military activities of the Chinese Communists are not "the first stage of an attack against Formosa"—if not, this seems to imply, we would not defend the coastal islands. "We know that friendly nations, on their own responsibility," Dulles went on, "are seeking to find substance for these hopes . . ."

Brownell on the Defensive: The opening of hearings on the government security program before the Humphrey subcommittee showed the effect of informer turnabouts and the Ladejinsky case. Assistant Attorney General William F. Tompkins of the Internal Security Division turned up with a 63-page statement but didn't get very far with it before he was put on the defensive and subjected to sharp questioning by Senators Humphrey, Symington and Norris Cotton (R., N.H.). Last August Humphrey was ready to throw the Bill of Rights overboard to prove himself no Red. Now he was rebutting the Justice Department's attempt to picture the attack on informers as a Red plot. Symington, too, has shifted with the political wind.

How Do You Tell? The questioning was naive and ill-informed. The Senators seemed to think that determining whether a man was a "subversive" was on a par with determining whether he had blue eyes or was over six feet tall; they spoke as if objective standards were possible and as if, by applying these standards, differences of opinion between Departments (as in the Ladejinsky case) could be prevented. But we have reached the stage where there are few liberals, much less radicals or actual Communists, left in the government. The danger, Tompkins said, is from those "who have been successful in keeping their Communist connections a secret from their friends and associates." Such persons would give only faint and distant indication of any liberal views. The inference is that everybody must now be watched and spied upon, and that one can never tell where a "subversive" may be lurking. When the public begins to wake up to the fact that this means everybody is suspect and no one to be trusted, we shall really see some political fireworks.

FBI Still a Sacred Cow: Senatorial questions also showed that the FBI, whose political illiteracy and sloppy methods are responsible for informer abuses, is still a sacred cow. Brownell is criticized for his meaningless new "reforms" which make no change whatsoever in existing security procedures, and for his brief in the *Peters* case. But both, in their defense of the informer as the cornerstone of thought control, only reflect the FBI's long and intense campaign to encourage gossip, snooping and spying as a means of political thought control . . . Solicitor General Sobeloff's failure to sign the *Peters* brief will be no surprise to readers of the *Weekly*; we reported last year that he differed sharply with Brownell on the Lattimore case and Rover's attack on Youngdahl . . .

The Natvig Case: This is an effort by indictment to frighten reformers who recant. Justice never bothered to investigate whether she lied about Ted Lamb, and already had a "recantation of her recantation" when the indictment was obtained.

Conscience Becomes Suspect

Next Thursday, March 17, the New York Board of Education votes on whether teachers must become informers to keep their jobs. Said one McCarthyite witness in favor of such a requirement, Thomas F. Flynn, for the Kings County (Brooklyn) American Legion, "I have heard a lot this afternoon about individual conscience. It seems to be the new Communist line."

Clark Foreman, who appeared against the proposed new rule on behalf of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, testified in rejoinder, "You have a spokesman for the American Legion say that the right of the individual conscience seems to be the new Communist line . . . Martin Luther is not regarded by the majority of Americans as either a heretic or a subversive."

(By strict definition, of course, Luther was both.)

A Documentary Not to Be Found Elsewhere in the U.S. Press . . .

The Text of the Exchange Which May Split the Labor Party

MR. ANEURIN BEVAN (Ebbw Vale, Lab) . . . The assumptions on which the [defense] programme was based were as inaccurate as the assumptions underlying the Prime Minister's speech yesterday. In 1950-51 they said we had three years. It had turned out to be more. Yesterday the Prime Minister said we had three or four years, but it might be wrong. They were merely wild guesses. The difficulty of the Prime Minister in making a speech in the House arose out of his virtues, out of his extraordinary capacity for presentation. The mediocrity of his thinking was concealed by the majesty of his language. (Opposition laughter.)

The Prime Minister yesterday spent the time of the House telling the nation and the world that the hydrogen bomb and the atom bomb between them had produced circumstances in which negotiation might be more fruitful. What they wanted to know was when the negotiations did start? (Loud opposition cheers.) . . .

If it be true and I think it is, what the Prime Minister said yesterday, will he tell the House why he does not insist upon meetings with the Russian leaders? It may be that they are not sincere in what they say, but there is only one way of finding out, and that is to meet them. It may be that the Prime Minister would like to do it but that the United States won't permit him. That is a sombre thing to say, it is a wicked thing to believe, but we have now reached a situation in Great Britain where we can, in a few short years, run the risk of the extinction of British civilization and we cannot reach the potential enemy in time to arrive at an accommodation because we are now at the mercy of the U. S.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL (Woodford, C.) It is absolutely wrong to suggest that the course which we have followed has been at the dictation of the United States. It is quite true that I would have liked to have seen a top-level conference of the three Powers. I would have liked to have seen it shortly after Mr. Malenkov took power, to see, as I said: 'Is there a new look?' I wanted to do that and my colleagues agreed . . . I prepared to go over and see the President and hoped to arrange with him to invite a three-Power conference. However I was struck down by a very sudden illness which paralyzed me completely physically. I had to put it off, and it was not found possible to persuade President Eisenhower to join in that process. [Emphasis added] . . .

MR. BEVAN said the House was grateful for the Prime Minister's intervention—(cheers)—but his statement was complete confirmation of what he (Mr. Bevan) had said. The Prime Minister had wanted to visit President Eisenhower in the hope of converting him to the project, but failed to do so . . .

(Continued on Page 3)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The hope here is of an easy conviction, but Mrs. Natvig is so unstable that further surprises are not to be excluded; these would add to public disgust with informers . . .

Anna Louise Strong Cleared: It is a pleasure to record Moscow's action in clearing the name of Anna Louise Strong. As one who defended Miss Strong at the time she was expelled from Moscow and several times protested the high-handed way she was branded a spy without hearing or even statement of concrete charges, we take our hat off to the Russians for this act of justice. Given peace, we believe the witch hunt will abate on both sides.

Testing the New Immunity Law

The immunity statute passed at the last session of Congress has two parts, one dealing with witnesses before grand juries and courts, the other with witnesses before Congressional committees. It is the constitutionality of the former which will be argued before the U.S. Court of Appeals in New York next Wednesday (March 16) in the case of William Ludwig Ullman. This former Air Force major and U.S. Treasury official had refused to talk even on offer of immunity when called before a Grand Jury. His appearance marked the latest of Attorney General Brownell's attempts to exhume and make political capital of the Elizabeth Bentley charges that the late Harry Dexter White was the center of a Soviet spy ring in Washington during World War II. Brownell had hoped, with the use of the new immunity law, to have some sensations ruinous to the Democrats ready in time for election, but his plans miscarried.

Last Tuesday, in New York, Federal Judge Tom Murphy, the prosecutor of Hiss, imposed a six months sentence on Ullman for contempt with the right to purge. This means that if Ullman loses his appeal, he can still avoid the jail sentence by talking. A three man appeals bench presided over by Judge Medina that same afternoon reversed Judge Murphy's refusal to grant bail pending appeal, and Ullman went free on $5,000. Should Ullman lose, this will not decide the more difficult question of whether witnesses before Congressional committees may be forced to talk on promise of immunity. Ullman himself may prefer to go to jail if he loses—or he may decide to tell the truth, and again deny the Bentley charges as he did originally. That would expose him to an ordeal by perjury, with his word against Miss Bentley's.

Censorship by Incinerator

The postoffice seems to be operating a political *index expurgatorius* in dealing with foreign mail, and given the least encouragement might extend the practice to domestic. The latest issue of the British pacifist weekly, *Peace News*, to reach this country by air (the issue dated Feb. 25) reports that British pacifist and other non-Communist radical books and pamphlets are being seized along with Soviet books and periodicals from the international mails and burned at the Boston postoffice. Among others so treated were books and pamphlets issued by the Movement for Colonial Freedom and the Union of Democratic Control.

Peace News cites two articles in the *Boston Post* of last January 13 and 14 as its authority. The newspaper reported that only a few research centers are being allowed freely to receive such "Red" literature, that certain well known publications are automatically destroyed and others analyzed on the spot for consignment to the incinerator if the inspectors regard them as containing dangerous thoughts.

In the same category is the news that the Postoffice is now doing all it can to prevent the delivery of *Izvestia* and *Pravda* to persons "not authorized to receive them." George F. Kennan, once our Ambassador to Moscow, protested this in a letter to the *New York Times* March 6, asking whether there were people in the government with so little faith in "our own political philosophy" and with so high an evaluation of our adversaries "that we must shield our people physically from every confrontation with Communist thought?"

Indeed it is but a short and easy step from labelling dangerous thoughts, as under the McCarran Internal Security Act, to burning the books in which they might be found.

Convenient Dummy

The Atomic Energy Commission is appointing representatives to an electric utility advisory conference on proposed AEC licensing regulations. Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, the chairman, promised that in determining "the composition of the electric utility conference, the selection of participants was made with a view to assuring reasonable diversification as to geographic location and size of organization, and representation of both privately and publicly owned utilities."

But the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, which represents 936 rural electric coops in 42 states and Alaska, and is anxious to assure a fair share of atomic power for its members, protests that Strauss named only one coop representative to his conference. "This cooperative," it declares in a public letter to Strauss," is a non-operating paper organization and does not have a paid manager or any employees. How can such an organization possibly be representative of the needs and problems of the rural electric systems?"

A less high-minded publication than ours would say this is certainly a *straws* in the wind of atomic power.

Bevan's Historic Challenge on the H-Bomb to Attlee and Churchill

A "Deterrent" That Would Mean Britain's Own Extinction

(Continued from Page 2)

They were now given to understand that when reference was made to hydrogen nuclear weapons as deterrents, it was meant that they would be used at once in the beginning of any sort of hostilities.

Did the leaders of the [Labor Party] Opposition mean in their amendment what the Government meant in the White Paper? Did they mean that nuclear weapons would be used with the support of the British Labour movement against any sort of aggression? He wanted an answer, because if the Leader of the Opposition said that was his interpretation of the amendment he (Mr. Bevan) would not vote for it. It would be plain insanity to say that wherever aggression occurred in Europe, no matter of what sort, it would be answered by the use of nuclear weapons, which, the Prime Minister had said, would involve the destruction of the British nation.

The question was not a complicated one that required long elucidation. The Commander-in-Chief of the allied forces had said that whether the enemy used it or not, if attacked we would use at once the weapon that, used against us, would result in extinction. Iid the Prime Minister think that if the people of the country understood that he would be in office a week?

All that the Prime Minister had said was that he was postponing discussion with the Soviet Union to get a German army that everyone knew would be of no use. (Opposition cheers.) All the generals were saying that armies would be of no use. It was true to say that if such a war broke out the armies would be farther away at the end than at the beginning because they would have to march away from the radioactive areas they created. If one wanted to be safe one should join the army. (Laughter.)

The Prime Minister said yesterday that he would meet the Soviet leaders, talk tough and then have supper. The last supper. (Some Opposition laughter.) If he met them and they would not give in, what would he do, pout and say he would commit suicide? That was where the nation had got; one had to agree with one's enemy or commit suicide. International difficulties had to be negotiated or mankind died. It was the point of no return. Millions of money were being spent on foolishness.

The issue was simple. Was Britain to talk peace or to talk war? He begged the Government to match up to the magnitude of the problem. Let the Prime Minister do deeds that matched his great words, not attempt to delude the country by the majesty of his language but inspire it with the dedication of his behaviour. **—House of Commons, March 2, 1955**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Travel Czarina Mrs. Shipley Grooms a Successor in Her Own Image

Washington Post Says McCarthyite Picked for Passport Control Job

Once upon a time in the days of the New Deal and the Blue (NRA) Eagle, the picturesque Gen. Hugh Johnson had a picturesque secretary named Frances Knight. In 1939, in disappointment over a promotion, Miss Knight "defected" and left the New Deal to work for the G.O.P. Congressional Campaign Committee. Since April, 1953, Miss Knight has been Scott McLeod's assistant at State. According to a special story in the *Washington Post* (March 2), she is favored by Mrs. Ruth B. Shipley to succeed her as chief of the passport division when Mrs. Shipley retires at the end of the month.

The career of Miss Knight (in private life Mrs. Wayne W. Parrish) as sketched by *Post* Reporter Warren Unna should clear away any lingering suspicion of a New Deal taint. A native of Rhode Island, daughter of an English father and Czech mother, Miss Knight worked during the war for Voice of America and figured in a conflict within the Czech division.

According to the *Washington Post*, "Miss Knight was very interested in the Slovakian separatist movement founded by a priest, Father Joseph Tiso, who headed Hitler's puppet government."

Worked With Robert E. Lee

The *Post* reported that Martin Merson, chief aide to Dr. Robert L. Johnson during the latter's short term as U.S. information chief, "said he once heard McLeod tell Johnson: Frances Knight helped expose Voice of America personnel to Senators McCarthy and Bridges." The *Post* said Miss Knight has also been serving as liaison between McLeod's office and Congressmen seeking the appointment of proteges to jobs in State.

Her procedure, according to the *Post*, is first to get the security file of the person occupying the desired job and if anything suspicious turns up "the employe may be summoned and told it will be to his own good to resign." If the security file is barren, "Civil Service regulations are scanned to see how the job might be abolished and reconstituted" under a different name. According to the *Post's* informants within the State Department, Miss Knight "was known for her conscientiousness in retrieving inter-office memoranda and passing them on to Congressman Taber," for whom she worked after she left the New Deal. This was done, the *Post* related, "through Robert E. Lee, former Taber committee chief investigator, former FBI man and now a Federal Communications Commissioner."

It was the Taber committee which did the first postwar attack on State, and it was Lee who made the Taber committee's list of suspected Reds available to McCarthy after his West Virginia speech.

Said Mrs. Shipley to the *Washington Post*: "Miss Knight's a very highly estimable lady and most intelligent and very fine . . . Yes, my successor has been chosen—by me! Don't you think that after 27 years I should know what's needed."

Who Says the Press Is Not Discreet?

It has been a long time since the *Washington Post*, sometimes regarded as a semi-official mouthpiece of State, has so taken out on the warpath against any official of that Department. But the story has yet to be picked up generally, and the press has shown a vast disinterest in who Mrs. Shipley's successor is likely to be. The *Washington Post* said it could not reach Miss Knight for comment and the State Department press office a week later not only had no statement to make but volunteered that very few if any newspapermen had even asked about the *Post* story. This shows how discreet the profession, on occasion, can be.*

Senate approval of the appointment is not required. But considering the passport division's long record of arbitrary rule, is there no one in Congress willing to ask for an investigation before Mrs. Shipley can pick her successor? This is a good time and a good issue on which to write your Senator or Congressman if you don't want another reactionary travel czarina in that job.

* If there's anything newspapermen like to do, it's travel.

Astringent Footnote on *Life* Magazine's New Series Glorifying Religion

"In the vast panic which followed on the French Revolution, the multitude of mediocre minds in the [British] middle and upper classes, formerly deistic or indifferent, took fright at unbelief as something now visibly connected with democracy and regicide; new money endowments were rapidly bestowed on the Church; and orthodoxy became fashionable on political grounds just as skepticism had become fashionable at the [English 17th Century] Restoration. Class interest and political prejudice wrought much in both cases; only in opposite directions. Democracy was no longer Bibliolatrous [as with the revolutionary Puritans of the 17th Century], therefore aristocracy was fain to become so, or at least to grow respectful to the Church as a means of social control."

—J. M. Robertson: A History of Freethought, Vol. II, 795

Still Offering Stone's *Truman Era* ($3) Free With Every Two Subs, and One Can Be a Renewal

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name_____

Street_____

City _____ **Zone**____ **State**____

Enter this gift sub for $4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name_____

Street_____

City _____ **Zone**____ **State**____

*** $1 extra for Canada.** 8/14/55

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED